



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

many other writers. He takes up the character of the Jewess—for Dr. Walter thinks that in Thackeray's original conception of Becky's character she was a Jewess,—and finds her very rarely used as playing the principal rôle in a novel. The governess occurs oftener, especially in the novels by women, Edgeworth, Austen, etc. Becky has many predecessors who married above their station, but is original in that she is continually referring to it herself. In Puritanic England the sinner Becky is rather an unusual type, and one would look for her prototype in Balzac rather than in English fiction. The good but weak Amelia we meet with occasionally, though Dr. Walter rather maliciously suggests that in prudish England we might expect to find her more often than we do. But the characters of the rich aunt and the spinster, as typified by Lady Crawley, and that of the ungainly suitor—Dobbin, seem to have been original creations of Thackeray's own. These few instances will be sufficient to show the painstaking thoroughness with which the investigation has been carried on.

If, however, Thackeray in *Vanity Fair* used over again characters and incidents which he had used before, and was strongly influenced by Fielding, Balzac and other writers in the development of his novel, yet this work stands far above those preceding works, in fact, in a class of his own; and this victory Dr. Walter thinks is due to Thackeray's "eye for a snob."

SARA T. BARROWS.

Ohio State University.

Bataille de Dames ou un Duel en Amour, par Scribe et Legouvé, ed. by CHARLES A. EGGERT, Ph. D., Professor of French in Illinois Wesleyan University. American Book Company.

If, in a body of teachers of Modern Languages, the question were raised, what constitutes an ideal edition of a text-book to be read in the class-room, undoubtedly the opinions expressed would be widely divergent. On the following points, however, a consensus of opinion would probably be quickly reached: whatever the notes may give or omit, they must be absolutely accurate with regard to

the linguistic facts stated, and they should, moreover, be lucidly clear in their mode of presenting these facts.

This requisite accuracy and clearness are lacking to a remarkable degree in the otherwise careful and attractive edition of the *Bataille des Dames* before us. Some of the most obvious inaccuracies and misleading statements are the following:

Page 13, note 20. L'ON for ON when either the preceding word (ET) or the next word (ASSURE) begins with a vowel.

This statement, however, is contradicted by the text itself on page 16, where we find (l. 6) à la maison l'on and on a raison (l. 8). Note 6, page 16, tries to account for the first by saying "l'on for on because of on in maison. The repetition would be inelegant." But the last syllable of maison is -son not on, and there is little to choose between l'on : son on one side and on : son on the other. The usual explanation given (e. g., Fraser and Squair, 403) though possibly incomplete, comes undoubtedly nearer the truth.

P. 16, l. 1. "il me semblait que. . . j'allais devenir parfaite." Note 1 "j'allais here = j'irais. This substitution of an imperfect indicative for a conditional is idiomatic." But a little careful consideration shows that no such substitution takes place in this case. The equation should read j'allais devenir = je deviendrais. In English, as well as in French, the verb "to go," "aller," is used with anticipatory force: I am going to become = I shall become; je vais devenir = je deviendrai. Just so, in the past, I was going to become = I would become; and j'allais devenir = je deviendrais, but by no means j'irais devenir.

P. 16, l. 9. la robe que je vous vois, Note 9. "Notice the peculiar substitution of que for dans laquelle, very common in conversational language." Again, this substitution is non-existent. Que is here a "complément direct" of vois, while "vous" is a "complément indirect" (perhaps best designated by the borrowed term "dative of reference"), and the equivalent of the sentence is, la robe que je vois à vous, not, certainly, la robe dans laquelle je vous vois. This is easily proved by a change of person, la robe que je lui vois, and not la robe que je LA vois (which would be required as an equivalent of la robe dans laquelle je la vois). Parallel constructions are

plentiful in French, *je lui trouve bonne mine, le médecin lui a trouvé la fièvre*, etc.

P. 32, l. 22. N. "*Qu'est-ce que* ; compare this form with *est-ce que* ; both are emphatic." This sweeping statement is misleading. Whatever they may have been at their origin, nowadays their use has become obligatory and not at all emphatic with certain verbs (for example, most monosyllabic first persons sing.), and common with all. *Est-ce que je pars ? Qu'est-ce que je sens ?* are the habitual, by no means emphatic, forms. In other cases, indeed, some degree of emphasis may still persist.

P. 54, l. 10. "*Qui te retient ?* This *qui* is in common use though *que* is grammatically correct." What student could be blamed who, on the strength of this statement, should frame the sentence *Que te retient ?* But the interrogative *que* is not used in French as subject (except with a few intransitive verbs), and the grammatically correct form is *qu'est-ce qui te retient ?*

P. 96, l. 20. *je vous en supplie*. N. "*en* in such connections anticipates an objective clause beginning with *de*." Not exactly a "clause," since *de* would be followed by an infinitive and not by a finite verb. A following clause would be properly introduced by *que*. *Je vous en supplie* = *Je vous supplie de le faire* = *Je vous supplie que vous le fassiez*.

P. 112, line 14. *C'est du génie*. N. "Observe that the partitive article so frequent in French has often no equivalent in English because the mere absence of the article indicates the partitive idea." True enough, so far as English is concerned, but does not this statement convey the erroneous idea that in French the *article* itself indicates the partitive idea ? This is obviously not so. The partitive idea is conveyed in French as little as in English by the article, it is the preposition *de* which is essential in French to partitive expressions. In *j'ai du vin* and *je n'ai pas de vin*, we have partitive expressions one with the article, one without it. The term "partitive article" should be abandoned since it completely obscures the real question, and this has been done, in fact, by some of the latest grammars.

The annotations in a text-book dealing directly with the language as it is actually written, can become an invaluable aid to the scholarly teaching of living languages, if they keep abreast of

the progress which is being made in the field of linguistic research. They should never lag behind even the best modern grammars, which by their very nature cannot help remaining somewhat conservative.

C. J. CIPRIANI.

St. Louis.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TRANSLATION OF OLD ENGLISH VERSE.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS :—In the December issue of the *Notes*, Professor C. G. Child attacks a statement of mine to the effect that "no greater mistake exists than to suppose that the rhythm and style" of oldest English poetry "cannot be rendered adequately in modern English speech." He gives two serious reasons for a contrary assertion. "Modern 'Old English' verse," he says, "does not sound in the least like real Old English verse. It is a bastard archeological fabrication, or an atavistic degenerate, or—something else; and it never will be anything else unless" a real poet takes hold of it. The italics are mine, and are intended to express an emotion roused indeed to highest pitch by the Ernulphian sweep of this denunciation, but tempered by awe at the thought of degeneracy which is atavistic, and of something else which never will be anything else, and of my own criminal folly in doing a deed which bears such names. Professor Child's second reason, however, is less overwhelming. The constraints of the Sievers types and of initial rime, he says, keep a translator from "precision of meaning" and from "poetic inspiration." I venture to answer this objection out of hand. Its particular terms really belong with my critic's first and sweeping reason for rejecting the translation in verse, but its general scope of complaint seems to me thoroughly and permanently defeated by a single line from Goethe's great gospel of the poetic art,—

In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister,—

a line that may be applied even to the humble function of the translator, and also by Kant's pretty figure of the dove and its vain wish for